



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

believed it throughout the war. The present government of the United States has reaffirmed that faith and purpose of the American people. We believed then, we believe now, in the establishment of a sound basis on which can be built a firm and just peace under which the various nations of Europe can achieve once more economic independence and stability. In his memorandum to Dr. Walter Simons, German Foreign Minister, under date of April 4, Secretary Hughes uses precisely this language. Evidently the present administration feels no enmity for Germany. In the same note Mr. Hughes says: "This government believes that it recognizes in the memorandum of Dr. Simons a sincere desire on the part of the German Government to reopen negotiations with the Allies on a new basis, and hopes that such negotiations, once resumed, may lead to a prompt settlement, which will at the same time satisfy the just claims of the Allies and permit Germany hopefully to renew its productive activities."

The third fact is that the present administration evidently has more respect for the Hague conferences and the Permanent Court of Arbitration existing at The Hague than did the Wilson administration. This is evident from the fact that, under date of April 1, Secretary Hughes suggested to the Norwegian Government that Norway's claims against the United States for ships requisitioned during the war be submitted to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague. It appears that this note was sent to the Norwegian Minister, Mr. Bryn, now in Washington. Chairman Benson, of the Shipping Board, is authority for the explanation that the Shipping Board had made an allowance of \$14,157,000 for a number of contracts for ships under construction in this country for Norwegians before the war. These ships were taken over by this government, however, during the war and completed. Norway expresses dissatisfaction with the amount, contending that allowance should be made for the speculative value of the contracts, due to the increased price of tonnage during the war. The Shipping Board refused to accept this argument and referred the question to the State Department for adjustment. Minister Bryn made representation to Secretary Hughes, in reply to which Mr. Hughes offered the suggestion that the matter be referred to The Hague Court. Thus we are encouraged to believe that the new administration not only remembers the work done at The Hague, but sympathizes with it and looks to it as a practical method of settling international disputes.

We may reasonably expect that the future of American foreign policy will evolve out of a past that is known and tried. The day of wildcatting in international relations is, we fondly believe, about to end.

ORGANIZING FOR PEACE

IT OUGHT not to be necessary in these days to quote the remark of Isocrates that "Civilization is a bond transcending nationality." Success in the development of individual States depends upon the development also of a world cosmopolitanism.

While men generally will agree to this truth, there are two tendencies which obstruct its realization. One of these is the disposition to demand too much. Nearly a thousand years ago there was an attempt to stop feudal wars by a league to enforce peace, but the plan was objected to by Bishop Gerard of Cambrai as provocative more of universal perjury than universal peace, which proved to be the case. Alexander I of Russia urged the adoption of a league to enforce peace; indeed, he succeeded in embodying such a project in a secret article of the Treaty of St. Petersburg, signed by Great Britain and Russia, April 11, 1805. But while the project became the basis of the Holy Alliance ten years later, it was as a matter of fact too ambitious to be applied. The failure of Versailles resulted because of the attempt to accomplish the impossible. As W. Allison Phillips wrote in the *Edinburgh Review*, under date of April, 1917: "The only conceivable basis of an international juridical system is the *status quo* as defined in treaties; therefore a new league to enforce peace would, like the old Holy Alliance, be committed to stereotyped political systems, which though reasonably satisfactory at the outset, might not remain so." It is now clear to all that the attempt to end the war and to set up an international organization for peace at one and the same time was more ambitious than wise. We now know that Mr. Lansing favored the adoption by the Conference in Paris of a resolution embodying a series of declarations as to the creation, the nature, and the purposes of a League of Nations, which declarations could be included in the preliminary treaty of peace, accompanied by an article providing for the negotiation of a detailed plan, or else by an article providing for the summoning of a world congress in which all nations, neutrals as well as belligerents, would be represented and have a voice in the drafting of a convention establishing a League of Nations in accordance with the general principles declared in the preliminary treaty. He believed in the need for a speedy restoration of a state of peace. He favored, therefore, the postponement of the determination of the details of the organization of the League of Nations until the proposed League should be thoroughly considered. The attempt at one and the same time to end the war and to set up an international organization for peace was a mistake. It was a mistake primarily because the treaty of peace was a war measure, drafted by a war psychology. The establishment of an organization for

international peace requires a peace psychology. The war, as we now know, should have been ended by the warriors unequivocally. The attempt to set up an international organization for peace should have been attempted by other men in another place and actuated by the single motive of promoting the cause of justice between nations. That men attempted the impossible is the cause of the tragedy and the failure. To attempt too much is the weakness of tyros. The tragedy and failure in Paris, due to the attempt to accomplish the impossible, and that by impossible means, appears in the continuance of the war between France and Germany, between Greece and Turkey, and elsewhere. The Russian situation has threatened civilization longer than would have been the case had the war been settled promptly in Paris, and that as a final step in the war.

But if the disposition to attempt too much has operated to the postponement of peace, the disposition to attempt too little also postpones progress. The demands of France upon Germany are not enough. The demands of Great Britain upon India are not enough. The demands of the Bolsheviki are not enough. The demands of Greece in Asia Minor are not enough. The demands of Japan in China are not enough. The demands of the United States in Mexico are not enough. The demands of the so-called League of Nations are not enough. Mr. Ralston's demands, appearing elsewhere in this issue, are not enough. This may be said of the demands of the Pan American Union, of the Christian church, of party politics, and the United States Senate. All such persons must realize now that only through international organizations for peace, by which we mean a conference of all nations meeting in accordance with the principles of representative delegates adopting rules of action for the nations and submitting those rules for ratification by the various governments, all with the full understanding that such rules shall upon ratification become laws for the government of the nations which ratify, can world peace be advanced. No mere political organization of the few can be depended upon as an organization for peace. The only organization for world peace must take the form of an international conference of all the nations to the end that legal principles may be set up, proclaimed, understood, and obeyed by the nations of the world. It is not men but laws that the nations will willingly accept, understand, and obey.

These things are so patent and inviolable that we may reasonably expect, and that right early, to hear of conversations among the accredited representatives of governments looking toward the calling of a world conference. Only by such a procedure can the nations organize for peace. In Mr. Lansing's book entitled "The Peace Negotiations" are these words: "Knowing the contempt which Mr. Wilson felt for The Hague tribunal, and his

general suspicion of the justice of decisions which it might render, it seemed to me inexpedient to suggest that it should form the basis of a newly constituted judiciary, a suggestion which I should have made had I been dealing with any other than President Wilson." As we now know, Mr. Lansing was right and Mr. Wilson was wrong. While it is not necessary to attempt too much, it is important that we do not attempt too little. The duty of every friend of international peace is to exert all his influence in behalf of a conference of all the nations, for in that direction, and only in that direction, lies any hopeful organization for the peace of the world.

YOUNG DEMOCRACY

"YOUNG DEMOCRACY" is an arresting phrase. Democracy that bids us hope must wear the rose of youth upon it. There is nothing to be gained even if we succeed in proving Pope to have been justified in his remark that, "In youth and beauty wisdom is but rare!" It has been a pleasure for us to receive from time to time the publication called "Young Democracy," advertised as "A Journal of the New Generation," published at 51 Greenwich Avenue, New York City. The fourth number of volume 2 is now before us. Its leading article deals with Russian students and the revolution, showing the part that students have taken in the revolutionary activities in Russia, an article by a young man who, while serving in the American forces on the Archangel front, was taken prisoner by the Bolshevik army. Finding that continental universities are often hotbeds of reform and revolution, the author is impressed unfavorably by the conservatism of American universities. He feels that now, when a new political and industrial era is clamoring to be born, progressive leadership is lacking in America and that what is needed is "reform and revolution," with roots among our undergraduates. Another article deals with the awakening undergraduates, "an inferior lot, sublimely unconscious of the great social problems of their times." And yet we are told that there seems to be an increasing interest among American college students in "the great social forces." The writer believes it to be hopeful that student self-government has taken a great impetus. The demand for courses in the social sciences is increasing. Groups within the colleges indicate the desire of the students themselves for more freedom and self-direction in the search for social facts. There should be, the writer believes, an intercollegiate movement controlled by undergraduates functioning through some central body capable of sustaining student effort during successive college generations. Many of the students want this. Many members of faculties approve it.